

65



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/681,422	03/30/2001	Phani Kumar Bidarahalli	390086.94723	3206
28382	7590	02/23/2005	EXAMINER	
QUARLES & BRADY LLP 411 E. WISCONSIN AVENUE SUITE 2040 MILWAUKEE, WI 53202-4497			MANIWANG, JOSEPH R	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2144		

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/681,422	BIDARAHALLI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Joseph R Maniwang	2144

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08/20/04.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 30 March 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-9 and 14-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nguyen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,920,692), hereinafter referred to as Nguyen.
4. Regarding claims 1, 14, and 17, Nguyen disclosed a method and system for a remote notification service. Nguyen disclosed an event source ("Multi-User Server"), an event listener for receiving events from the event source ("Listener"/"Monitoring Tool"), and an event name service ("Notification Directory") through which both the event sources or event listeners could register with (see column 1, lines 49-53; column 3, lines 7-14, 26-34; column 4, lines 28-32).

5. Regarding claims 2 and 16, Nguyen disclosed that event sources and event listeners could reside on separate physical machines, thus differing in at least the respective devices on which each host resides as claimed (see column 4, lines 33-37).

6. Regarding claim 3, Nguyen disclosed that communication between event sources and even listeners could occur by way of LAN (see column 2, lines 24-30), thus disclosing communication by way of internet as claimed, and further disclosed the use of Java applets as claimed (see column 3, lines 14-18).
7. Regarding claim 4, Nguyen further disclosed the ability to deregister from the event name service in addition to registering as claimed (see column 3, lines 10-14).
8. Regarding claim 5, Nguyen disclosed a plurality of additional listener objects as claimed (see column 3, lines 26-27).
9. Regarding claim 6, Nguyen disclosed that additional event listeners could receive events from an event source based on whether or not the particular listener was registered with the event name service, thus delivering events based upon an event name service filter as claimed (see column 3, lines 28-34).
10. Regarding claim 7, Nguyen disclosed an event source delivering events to a set of registered event listeners, thus disclosing a multicast mode of operation as claimed (see column 3, lines 26-35).
11. Regarding claim 8, Nguyen disclosed additional event sources, and further that a list of available event sources could be provided in response to a command issued by an event listener (see column 4, lines 11-27).
12. Regarding claims 9 and 18, Nguyen disclosed the broad concept of the event name service acting as a proxy for an event source as claimed where the event name service received an event at a Notifier before delivering the event to a registered event listener (see column 3, lines 26-34).

13. Regarding claim 15, Nguyen disclosed the use of ORB (see column 4, lines 12-27). Examiner submits that ORB was well-known in the art as part of the OMG standard which defined CORBA, thus disclosing the use of CORBA as claimed.
14. Regarding claim 19, Nguyen disclosed both providing a list of registered event sources and unregistering event sources/listeners from the event name service as claimed (see column 4, lines 11-27; column 3, lines 10-14).
15. Regarding claim 20, Nguyen disclosed an event source ("Multi-User Server"), an event listener for receiving events from the event source ("Listener"/"Monitoring Tool"), and an event name service ("Notification Directory") through which both the event sources or event listeners could register with (see column 1, lines 49-53; column 3, lines 7-14, 26-34; column 4, lines 28-32). Nguyen further disclosed providing a list of services in response to a request (see column 4, lines 11-27), and firing a desired event from the event source to a registered event listener as claimed (see column 3, lines 26-34). Determining whether a desired event source is registered as claimed is inherent in the invention of Nguyen as it was disclosed that a Multi-User Server registered its Notification Directory services with a local ORB in order to enable remote applications to query event services (see column 4, lines 12-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

16. Claims 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,920,692), hereinafter referred to as Nguyen, and further in view of what was well-known at the time of invention.

17. Nguyen disclosed a method and system for a remote notification service. Nguyen disclosed an event source ("Multi-User Server"), an event listener for receiving events from the event source ("Listener"/"Monitoring Tool"), and an event name service ("Notification Directory") through which both the event sources or event listeners could register with (see column 1, lines 49-53; column 3, lines 7-14, 26-34; column 4, lines 28-32). Nguyen disclosed employing the use of Java for defining event interfaces used between event sources and event listeners (see column 32, lines 7-25).
18. Examiner submits that the use of library packages in a computer networking environment was well known in the art at the time the invention was made.
19. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to consider the use of library packages in the system of Nguyen. As previously recited, Nguyen disclosed the use of Java. It was well known at the time of invention that the Java programming language included the use of libraries. Although Nguyen does not teach the specifically named library packages claimed, the claimed library package names are not commonly used in the art and are an arbitrary choice left to the artisan. Furthermore, the functionality of the specific library packages are not defined in the claims, and are instead described in terms of structure by which library/class/subclass name is included in the package. As such, the claims provide no substantial subject matter other than the broad use of library packages, which is inadequate to differentiate the invention over the prior art.

20. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nguyen et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,920,692), hereinafter referred to as Nguyen, and further in view of Licato et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,356,780), hereinafter referred to as Licato.

21. Nguyen disclosed a method and system for a remote notification service. Nguyen disclosed an event source ("Multi-User Server"), an event listener for receiving events from the event source ("Listener"/"Monitoring Tool"), and an event name service ("Notification Directory") through which both the event sources or event listeners could register with (see column 1, lines 49-53; column 3, lines 7-14, 26-34; column 4, lines 28-32). The invention of Nguyen generally related to a method and system for standardizing general purpose services without constricting such a system to a particular browser application (see column 1, lines 20-23).

22. While the invention of Nguyen relates to a general purpose service architecture between clients and servers, Nguyen does not specifically disclose the use of an MRI medical imaging system, a CT system, a PET medical imaging system, an x-ray scanner, or a nuclear imaging scanner in such a system.

23. In a related art of medical devices, Licato disclosed a method for managing medical imaging devices and their associated peripherals. Licato disclosed common imaging systems in the medical field, including MRI, CT, x-ray, and PET (see column 1, lines 17-32; column 2, lines 43-62).

24. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of Nguyen and Licato to use the system described by Nguyen in the context of an MRI, CT, PET, or x-ray system as claimed. The

invention of Nguyen sought to provide improved event communications between servers and clients. Licato recognized a need for an improved technique for managing data relating to medical imaging systems and peripherals (see column 2, lines 33-40). Including such systems in the system of Nguyen would have extended the suggested functionality to them, thus providing the benefits of allowing such devices to interoperate, creating a system where a wider variety of medical devices could communicate data.

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
26. Examiner accepts Applicant's corrections to Drawings/Specification in overcoming previous objections. Regarding claims 15 and 16, Examiner also accepts Applicant's amendment of the claims in overcoming previous rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112(2). Accordingly, the objections and rejections have been withdrawn.
27. Applicant asserts that the previously cited references do not teach an event name service or other application or program at which one or more event sources or event listeners are able to register. Examiner submits that the newly cited prior art clearly discloses the broad concept of the claimed event name service for registering an event listener or event source as detailed in the above rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Fernando et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,363,435) disclosed event sourcing and filtering for transient objects in a hierarchical object model.

Hinson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,829,770) disclosed an object-based event communications system.

Hinson et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,748,455) disclosed an object-based event communications system.

Chu-Carroll et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2003/0212686) disclosed a method and system for linking a client and server for communicating events.

Wilson et al. (U.S. Pat. App. Pub. 2003/0163598) disclosed a method and system for distributing data events.

Wollrath et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,446) disclosed a system for transporting behavior in an event-based distributed system.

Tyra et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,442,565) disclosed a system for transmitting data using events.

Monday et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,434,740) disclosed a method and system for visually connecting two components.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph R Maniwang whose telephone number is (571) 272-3928. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A Cuchlinski can be reached on (571) 272-3925. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JM



WILLIAM A. CUCHLINSKI, JR.
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800